



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,263	09/30/2002	Akira Ohmura	106121.01	5672
25944	7590	08/21/2007		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER HERNANDEZ, NELSON D	
			ART UNIT 2622	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/065,263

Applicant(s)

OHMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Nelson D. Hernandez

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 14-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 14-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/576,221.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/31/2006
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on March 31, 2006 (January 14, 2003 Information Disclosure Statement) has been considered by the Examiner.

Response to Amendment

2. The Examiner acknowledges the amended claims filed on May 30, 2007.
Claims 1, 9 and 14 have been amended. **Claims 12 and 13** have been canceled.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1, 9 and 14** have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-11, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis, US Patent 6,721,001 B1 in view of Helot, US Patent 6,301,106 B1 and further in view of Morikawa et al., US Patent 5,528,285.**

Regarding claim 1, Berstis discloses a system (Fig. 1) for charging a battery (Fig. 2: 218) of, and for taking-out digital images from a memory (Fig. 2: 214) of a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102), the system comprising: a universal base (Fig. 1: 106) for supplying the battery with electric power and for taking out the digital images from the memory of a digital camera when the digital camera is coupled to the system, wherein the universal base is shaped to fit a surface that is not a surface with a maximum area (bottom of the digital camera) (Col. 1, lines 45-61; col. 2, line 15 – col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 5-63).

Berstis fails to teach that the system comprises an exchangeable holder removable mounted on the universal base, the exchangeable holder being shaped to be fitted to a specific one of the different models of digital cameras and also standardized for being mounted on the universal base.

However, Helot teaches a docking station (Fig. 1) having a plurality of adapter trays (Fig. 8) for a plurality of portable computers, wherein said plurality of adapter trays are configured for respective different type of portable computer so the data interface

Art Unit: 2622

would match to the one in the docking station in order to exchange data and power from/to each of the plurality of portable computers; Helot also teaches that the adapters can be labeled in order to easily identify to which type of portable computer belongs (Col. 2, line 55 – col. 4, line 37; col. 4, lines 54-65; col. 5, lines 17-26; col. 6, lines 33-39). Using exchangeable holders to adapt different type of electronic devices to a docking station is advantageous because it would reduce the number and variety of docking station products required to establish communication between the electronic device and an external device.

Although the teaching of Helot is for a portable computer and not for a digital camera, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the concept taught in Helot to Berstis so the docking station may have a plurality of adapters for different digital cameras so the docking station could transfer image data and recharge the battery of each of the plurality of digital cameras. Although the holders in Helot are shaped to fit the back of the electronic device (portable computer), however, when modifying the teaching of Berstis to adapt different types of digital cameras using the concept taught in Helot et al., the invention would result in a docking station having different holders that would fit in the bottom part of the digital (the bottom part of the camera being the surface that is not the surface with the maximum area) camera because the docking station in Berstis is designed to receive a digital camera having the interface connectors located at the bottom of the camera, thus the holder adapted for the docking station in Berstis needs to fit the bottom part of the digital camera since that is the part being fitted by the

docking station. The motivation to do so would have been to reduce the number and variety of docking station products required as suggested by Helot (Col. 2, lines 3-14).

The combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot fails to teach the universal base printing the digital images by a printer built into the universal base and the universal base including an indicator that indicates a print state of the printing performed by the printer.

However, Morikawa et al discloses a system (Fig. 38: 2150) for printing images, and for taking out images from the camera memory (Fig. 40, memories 22 and 23); the system comprising: a universal base (Fig. 38: 2151) for taking out the digital images from the memory of a digital camera when the digital camera is coupled to the system for printing the images stored in the digital camera using a printer (Fig. 38: 2151b) built into said universal base, wherein the universal base is shaped to fit a surface that is not a surface with a maximum area (bottom of the digital camera); Morikawa et al. also discloses the universal base including an indicator (display section 2156 as shown in fig. 38) that indicates a print state of the printing performed by the printer (displaying the target printing section designated by the operation of the key switches 2155, the number of printouts, the printing state of a card seal, etc.; col. 48, lines 3-16) (Col. 47, line 7 – col. 48, line 53).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot and further in view of Morikawa et al. as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Berstis and Helot by having the universal base with a built in printer to print the digital images of the camera and

having the printer with an indicator to indicate the print state of the printing performed by the printer. The motivation to so would have been to operate the universal base and the camera by using an interface disposed on the universal base; also to minimize the use of components of the system since the camera would not need to be connected to a computer to print the digital images stored in the camera while supplying the user with a hard copy of the digital images and would improve the operation the universal base to have the user aware of the operation of the printer such as estimating when the printer is finishing printing the images from the camera.

Regarding claim 2, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot and further in view of Morikawa et al as applied to claim 1 teaches that the exchangeable holder is a tray having an upper portion shaped to be fitted to a lower portion of the specific model of digital camera (The combination of Berstis in view of Helot would result in an adapter having an upper portion shaped to be fitted to a the lower portion of the specific model of digital camera since the interface of the docking station in Berstis has an upper portion to be fitted to the lower portion of the digital camera where the interface of said digital camera is located). Grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 3, limitations can be found in claim 1.

Regarding claim 4, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot and further in view of Morikawa et al as applied to claim 1 teaches a first electric connector to supply the battery with electric power and a second electric connector to take out the digital images from the memory, the first and the second connectors being designed to come into contact with the digital camera when the digital camera is laid on the tray

(Berstis teaches that the digital camera comprises an electric connector (Fig. 2: 219) to supply the battery with electric power and another electric connector (Fig. 2: 217) to take out the images for the memory to be transferred to the personal computer by way of the docking station, which comprises an electric connector (Fig. 1:108) to supply power to the battery of the digital camera and an electric connector (Fig. 1: 110) for transferring image data from the digital camera to the personal computer. The combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot as applied to claim 1 would result in the adapter having the same type of connections to adapt one of a plurality of different digital cameras into said docking station). Grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 5, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot and further in view of Morikawa et al as applied to claim 4 teaches that the first and second connectors are located at the tray, and wherein the universal base includes a third standardized electric connector (See Berstis, fig. 1:108) to supply the battery with electric power through the first connector and a fourth standardized electric connector (See Berstis, fig. 1: 110) to take out the digital images from the memory through the second electric connector. Grounds for rejecting claim 4 apply here.

Regarding claim 6, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot and further in view of Morikawa et al as applied to claim 3 teaches a first standardized electric connector to supply the battery with electric power and a second standardized electric connector to take out the digital images from the memory, the first and second standardized connectors are located at the universal base for a standardized coupling with the exchangeable holder (Berstis teaches that the digital camera comprises an

electric connector (Fig. 2: 219) to supply the battery with electric power and another electric connector (Fig. 2: 217) to take out the images for the memory to be transferred to the personal computer by way of the docking station, which comprises an electric connector (Fig. 1:108) to supply power to the battery of the digital camera and an electric connector (Fig. 1: 110) for transferring image data from the digital camera to the personal computer. The combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot and further in view of Morikawa et al as applied to claim 1 would result in the adapter having the same type of connections to adapt one of a plurality of different digital cameras into said docking station). Grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 7, Berstis discloses that the universal base leads to a power line (Fig. 1: 114; col. 3, lines 9-17).

Regarding claim 8, Berstis discloses that the universal base leads to a signal line (Fig. 1:116, col. 3, lines 9-17).

Regarding claim 9, Berstis discloses a system for a charging a battery of and for taking-out digital images from a memory of a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102), the system comprising: a universal base (Fig. 1: 106) for supplying the battery (Fig. 2: 218) with electric power and for taking out the digital images from the memory of the digital camera when the system is coupled to the digital camera, wherein the universal base is shaped to fit a surface that is not a surface with a maximum area (the bottom of the digital camera) (Col. 1, lines 45-61; col. 2, line 15 – col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 5-63).

Berstis fails to teach that the system charges a battery of and takes-out digital images from a memory of first and second models of digital cameras; a first

exchangeable holder removably mountable on the universal base, the first exchangeable holder being shaped to be fitted to the first model of digital camera and also standardized for being mounted on the universal base; and a second exchangeable holder removably mountable on the universal base in place of the first exchangeable holder, the second exchangeable holder being shaped to be fitted to the second model of digital camera and also standardized for being mounted on the universal base.

However, Helot teaches a docking station (Fig. 1) having a plurality of adapter trays (Fig. 8) for a plurality of portable computers, wherein said plurality of adapter trays are configured for respective different type of portable computer so the data interface would match to the one in the docking station in order to exchange data and power from/to each of the plurality of portable computers. Helot also teaches that the adapters can be labeled in order to easily identify to which type of portable computer belongs (Col. 2, line 55 – col. 4, line 37; col. 4, lines 54-65; col. 5, lines 17-26; col. 6, lines 33-39). Using exchangeable holders to adapt different type of electronic devices to a docking station is advantageous because it would reduce the number and variety of docking station products required to establish communication between the electronic device and an external device.

Although the teaching of Helot is for a portable computer and not for a digital camera, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the concept taught in Helot to Berstis so the docking station may have a plurality of adapters for different digital cameras so the docking

station could transfer image data and recharge the battery of each of the plurality of digital cameras. Although the holders in Helot are shaped to fit the back of the electronic device (portable computer), however, when modifying the teaching of Berstis to adapt different types of digital cameras using the concept taught in Helot et al., the invention would result in a docking station having different holders that would fit in the bottom part of the digital (the bottom part of the camera being the surface that is not the surface with the maximum area) camera because the docking station in Berstis is designed to receive a digital camera having the interface connectors located at the bottom of the camera, thus the holder adapted for the docking station in Berstis needs to fit the bottom part of the digital camera since that is the part being fitted by the docking station. The motivation to do so would have been to reduce the number and variety of docking station products required as suggested by Helot (Col. 2, lines 3-14).

The combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot fails to teach the universal base printing the digital images by a printer built into the universal base and the universal base including an indicator that indicates a print state of the printing performed by the printer.

However, Morikawa et al discloses a system (Fig. 38: 2150) for printing images, and for taking out images from the camera memory (Fig. 40, memories 22 and 23); the system comprising: a universal base (Fig. 38: 2151) for taking out the digital images from the memory of a digital camera when the digital camera is coupled to the system for printing the images stored in the digital camera using a printer (Fig. 38: 2151b) built into said universal base, wherein the universal base is shaped to fit a surface that is not

a surface with a maximum area (bottom of the digital camera); Morikawa et al. also discloses the universal base including an indicator (display section 2156 as shown in fig. 38) that indicates a print state of the printing performed by the printer (displaying the target printing section designated by the operation of the key switches 2155, the number of printouts, the printing state of a card seal, etc.; col. 48, lines 3-16) (Col. 47, line 7 – col. 48, line 53).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot and further in view of Morikawa et al. as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Berstis and Helot by having the universal base with a built in printer to print the digital images of the camera and having the printer with an indicator to indicate the print state of the printing performed by the printer. The motivation to so would have been to operate the universal base and the camera by using an interface disposed on the universal base; also to minimize the use of components of the system since the camera would not need to be connected to a computer to print the digital images stored in the camera while supplying the user with a hard copy of the digital images and would improve the operation the universal base to have the user aware of the operation of the printer such as estimating when the printer is finishing printing the images from the camera.

Regarding claim 10, limitations can be found in claim 9.

Regarding claim 11, the combined teaching of the Berstis in view of Helot and further in view of Morikawa et al as applied to claim 9 teaches that the universal base includes a space for containing either of the first and second exchangeable holders, one

of the first and second exchangeable holders being coupled with the universal base at a bottom of the space (The combination of Berstis in view of Helot would result in an adapter having an upper portion shaped to be fitted to a the lower portion of the specific model of digital camera since the interface of the docking station in Berstis has an upper portion to be fitted to the lower portion of the digital camera where the interface of said digital camera is located). Grounds for rejecting claim 9 apply here.

Regarding claim 15, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot and further in view of Morikawa et al as discussed and analyzed in claim 1, teaches that all models of digital cameras that use the universal base have a specified exchangeable holder. Therefore, grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 16, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot and further in view of Morikawa et al as discussed and analyzed in claim 9, teaches that all models of digital cameras that use the universal base have a specified exchangeable holder. Therefore, grounds for rejecting claim 9 apply here.

6. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis, US Patent 6,721,001 B1 and Helot, US Patent 6,301,106 B1 in view of Niikawa, US Patent 6,947,075 B1 and further in view of Morikawa et al., US Patent 5,528,285.

Regarding claim 14, Berstis discloses a digital camera system comprising a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102) having a memory (Fig. 2: 214), the holder system comprising: a digital image storage (personal computer; col. 2, lines 15-39) for

communicating with the digital camera when the digital camera is coupled to said digital image storage by using a universal base (Fig. 1: 106), wherein the digital image storage includes a storage medium (A storage medium is inherent in a personal computer to store data) that stores the taken out digital images, wherein the universal base is shaped to fit a surface that is not a surface with a maximum area (the bottom of the digital camera) (Col. 1, lines 45-61; col. 2, line 15 – col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 5-63)

Berstis fails to teach holders for a first and second models of digital cameras to be coupled to said first and second models of digital cameras for communicating to a digital image storage by using said holders, wherein the digital image storage includes a function unit having a program for taking out the digital images, the program being used when taking out the digital images in the first and the second models of digital cameras.

However, Helot teaches a docking station (Fig. 1) having a plurality of adapter trays (Fig. 8) for a plurality of portable computers, wherein said plurality of adapter trays are configured for respective different type of portable computer so the data interface would match to the one in the docking station in order to exchange data and power from/to each of the plurality of portable computers. Helot also teaches that the adapters can be labeled in order to easily identify to which type of portable computer belongs (Col. 2, line 55 – col. 4, line 37; col. 4, lines 54-65; col. 5, lines 17-26; col. 6, lines 33-39). Using exchangeable holders to adapt different type of electronic devices to a docking station is advantageous because it would reduce the number and variety of docking station products required to establish communication between the electronic device and an external device.

Although the teaching of Helot is for a portable computer and not for a digital camera, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the concept taught in Helot to Berstis so the docking station may have a plurality of adapters for different digital cameras so the docking station could transfer image data and recharge the battery of each of the plurality of digital cameras. Although the holders in Helot are shaped to fit the back of the electronic device (portable computer), however, when modifying the teaching of Berstis to adapt different types of digital cameras using the concept taught in Helot et al., the invention would result in a docking station having different holders that would fit in the bottom part of the digital (the bottom part of the camera being the surface that is not the surface with the maximum area) camera because the docking station in Berstis is designed to receive a digital camera having the interface connectors located at the bottom of the camera, thus the holder adapted for the docking station in Berstis needs to fit the bottom part of the digital camera since that is the part being fitted by the docking station. The motivation to do so would have been to reduce the number and variety of docking station products required as suggested by Helot (Col. 2, lines 3-14).

The combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot fails to teach that the image storage includes a function unit having a program for taking out the digital images, the program being used when taking out the digital images in the first and the second models of digital cameras.

However, Niikawa teaches a photographic apparatus (Figs. 1-4) connectable to a computer (Fig. 5: 1000), wherein said computer comprises software installed in the hard

Art Unit: 2622

drive (Fig. 5: HD1) for detecting the connection of the digital camera in order to permit transmission of images and control of the digital camera upon connection of said digital camera. Niikawa teaches that upon detection, the computer run a software for controlling operations of the digital camera (i.e. image transmission) (Col. 3, lines 17-46; col. 4, line 50 – col. 5, line 14; col. 6, line 63 – col. 7, line 60). Having a program to control the transfer of image data from the digital camera to the data storage is advantageous because it would provide a digital camera to easily and rapidly use the network sources by manipulations on the digital camera side, without adding special functions and performances to the digital camera so the digital camera can be kept compact without increasing power consumption.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot and further in view of Niikawa as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the holder system by having the digital image storage detecting when the digital camera is connected to said digital image storage and to run a software for controlling function in the digital camera. The motivation to do so would have been to provide a photographing apparatus taught by Berstis and Helot which can easily and rapidly use the network sources by manipulations on the digital camera side, without adding special functions and performances to the digital camera so the digital camera can be kept compact without increasing power consumption as suggested by Niikawa (Col. 1, line 65 – col. 2, line 26).

The combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot and further in view of Niikawa fails to teach the universal base printing the digital images by a printer built into the universal base and the universal base including an indicator that indicates a print state of the printing performed by the printer.

However, Morikawa et al discloses a system (Fig. 38: 2150) for printing images, and for taking out images from the camera memory (Fig. 40, memories 22 and 23); the system comprising: a universal base (Fig. 38: 2151) for taking out the digital images from the memory of a digital camera when the digital camera is coupled to the system to store said images in a memory (Fig. 41: 2172) of said universal base and for printing the images stored in the digital camera using a printer (Fig. 38: 2151b) built into said universal base, wherein the universal base is shaped to fit a surface that is not a surface with a maximum area (bottom of the digital camera); Morikawa et al. also discloses the universal base including an indicator (display section 2156 as shown in fig. 38) that indicates a print state of the printing performed by the printer (displaying the target printing section designated by the operation of the key switches 2155, the number of printouts, the printing state of a card seal, etc.; col. 48, lines 3-16) (Col. 47, line 7 – col. 48, line 53).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Berstis and Helot in view of Niikawa and further in view of Morikawa et al. as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Berstis, Helot and Niikawa by having the digital image storage with a built in printer to print the digital images of the camera and having the printer with an indicator to indicate the print state

of the printing performed by the printer. The motivation to so would have been to operate the universal base and the camera by using an interface disposed on the universal base; also to minimize the use of components of the system since the camera would not need to be connected to a computer to print the digital images stored in the camera while supplying the user with a hard copy of the digital images and would improve the operation the universal base to have the user aware of the operation of the printer such as estimating when the printer is finishing printing the images from the camera.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7311. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on (571) 272-7372. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nelson D. Hernandez
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

NDHH
August 6, 2007



LIN YE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER